

# PROPOSAL EVALUATION

## *Proposition 84 Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Grant Program Implementation Grant, Round 2, 2013*

<b>Applicant</b>	Inyo-Water Department, County of	<b>Amount Requested</b>	\$ 2,234,330
<b>Proposal Title</b>	Promoting Sustainability in the Inyo-Mono Region: Understanding Regional Groundwater Resources and Upgrading Infrastructure in DAC Water Systems	<b>Total Proposal Cost</b>	\$ 2,636,487

### PROJECT SUMMARY

The proposal consists of the following projects: (1) Inyo County and Program Office Administration; (2) Big Pine Fire Protection Improvement Project; (3) Amargosa Basin Water, Ecosystem Sustainability, and Disadvantaged Communities Project; (4) Inyo County Disadvantaged Communities Meters Project; and (5) Indian Wells Valley Groundwater Basin Brackish Water Resources Study.

### PROPOSAL SCORE

Criteria	Score/ Max. Possible	Criteria	Score/ Max. Possible
Work Plan	9/15	Technical Justification	4/10
Budget	3/5		
Schedule	5/5	Benefits and Cost Analysis	15/30
Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures	4/5	Program Preferences	5/10
Total Score (max. possible = 80)			45

### EVALUATION SUMMARY

#### WORK PLAN

The work plan criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation or rationales are incomplete or insufficient. The work plan states the goals and objectives of the proposal and how it helps achieve the goals and objectives of Inyo-Mono's IRWM Plan. A tabulated overview of each project, including project abstract and status, and DAC status, is on pages 7-10. The work plan describes most of the projects and their tasks in detail. However, the work plan appears to be missing a project as expressed in the summary description of the proposal. Project 1, Inyo County and Program Office Administration, is missing from the work plan. Project 2 is described as stand-alone, but the application states unless a separate water main improvement project (not part of this proposal) is completed, the hydrant project will be much less effective (Att.3, pages 17 and 22). Project 3 is the only project to include specific data management deliverables in its work plan.

## **BUDGET**

The budgets for more than half of the projects in the proposal have detailed cost information but not all costs appear reasonable or supporting documentation is lacking for a majority of the budget categories. Three out of the five projects in the budget do not have adequate supporting information. For example, projects 2 and 4 do not include labor rates to support the costs listed in the budget table. The Inyo County and Program Office Administration (project 1) budget shows a significant project administration cost and some tasks go beyond grant administrative duties that cannot be funded by this program. Project 5 has a large amount reserved in contingency for a feasibility study with no construction or implementation costs. Projects 2 and 4 contain an explanation of how the costs are estimated, but projects 3 and 5 do not. The projects and tasks in the budget are consistent with schedule but not with the work plan. Project 5 includes contingency costs in the budget but review of the work plan tasks indicates no construction so it is unclear why a contingency is included.

## **SCHEDULE**

The schedule criterion is fully addressed and is supported by thorough documentation and logical rationale. Each schedule's tasks are consistent with the work plan and budget and are considered reasonable. The schedule conveys that at least one project will be ready to begin construction no later than October 2014. All of the individual project schedules include project milestones and project predecessors or dependencies, but lack detail within each task in the schedule.

## **MONITORING, ASSESSMENT, AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES**

The criterion is fully addressed but is not supported by thorough documentation and sufficient rationale. Some targets are not appropriate. For example, targets for project 5 to evaluate performance include "Review of previous studies" but this is a project task, not a target. Not all measurement tools and methods effectively monitor project performance. For example, a measurement method to properly evaluate project 2 should be to "document" proper installation (as-built records) and testing of the hydrants. Finally, project 3's goals and objectives listed in the work plan do not match the goals and desired outcomes in attachment 6.

## **TECHNICAL JUSTIFICATION**

The technical justification cannot be determined due to a lack of documentation that demonstrates the technical adequacy of the projects and physical benefits are not well described. Only one project (project 2) appears to be technically justified to achieve the benefits claimed. Technical justification for the other projects cannot be determined and their physical benefits are not well described. For example, project 5 claims only one physical benefit, "Increased supply of groundwater"; however the proposed project will not produce a new water supply. Also, the Indian Wells Valley Study claims that the project will not result in any adverse physical benefits, but if a brackish water supply were ever developed, treating the water would have impacts (i.e. production of waste brine). Most of the proposed projects' table 9 data is either insufficient or does not support the narrative description of project benefits that proceed the table.

## **BENEFITS AND COST ANALYSIS**

Collectively the proposal is likely to provide a medium level of benefits in relationship to cost, but the quality of the analysis or clear and complete documentation is lacking. For project 2, the new fire hydrants are appropriately justified based on historic fires; however, it is not clear that new fire hydrants could cause wildfire losses to be avoided. Project 4 is justified based on the alternative cost of analog meters; the reason for the need for metering (an agreement with Los Angeles) should be further explained. The two groundwater studies might be justified more based on the reasonableness of the scope and cost-effectiveness of the work proposed. For the Amargosa study, there is no statement that specific actions will be taken in response to study results. For the Indian Wells brackish water study, it

appears that pumping and treatment of brackish groundwater might result, but a schedule and triggers for action are not provided.

#### **PROGRAM PREFERENCES**

Applicant claims that five program preferences and seven statewide priorities will be met with project implementation. However, applicant demonstrates high degree of certainty, and adequate documentation for four of the preferences claimed: (1) Include regional projects or programs; (2) Effectively integrate water management programs and projects; (3) Address critical water supply or water quality needs of disadvantaged communities within the region; and (4) Effectively integrate water management with land use planning.